1. In October 1988 the Slavists of the Netherlands celebrated the 75th anniversary of the founding of the chair for Balto-Slavic languages at the University of Leiden, the oldest chair for Slavic studies in the country. On this occasion a collection of essays on the life and work of Nicolaas van Wijk, the first professor to fill the Leiden chair from 1913 until his untimely death on 25 March 1941, was published (Groen et al. 1988). My contribution to this Gedenkschrift (Schaeken 1988a) deals with the sad vicissitudes and the reconstruction of Van Wijk's second part of his *Geschichte der altkirchenslavischen Sprache* (Zweiter Band: Syntax, Wortschatz und Wortbildung). After its completion in 1927 it remained unpublished until Van Wijk's death and, subsequently, disappeared without any trace probably somewhere in Germany during the Second World War.1

When Van Wijk died, he also left behind another major manuscript which he had completed in the late 1930s and which had not yet been published. It contained a critical edition of the Old Church Slavonic translation of the *'Aνάρων άγιων βίβλων*, known as the *Skete Patericon* (Skitskij paterik), with a sixty-page introduction (*Einleitung*) in German. For the basis of his edition Van Wijk used the abridged reduction of the *Skete Patericon* as found in the so-called *Mihanović-Patericon* (National Library, Vienna, MS Slav. 152 olim 137; Bulgarian, 14th c.), supplying the missing passages from three other manuscripts: National Library, Paris, MS Slav. 10 (Serbian, 14th c.); University Library, Leiden, MS BPL 2290 (Serbian, late 13th/early 14th c. — see below); MS Monastery Krka in Dalmatia (No. 34 in Van

1 This research was supported by the Netherlands organization for scientific research, N.W.O. I am grateful to Professor C.H. van Schooneveld and Mr. P. de Ridder for providing me with some interesting details on the vicissitudes of Van Wijk's manuscript (edited by Armstrong et al. 1975).

1 As far as I know, there is also one article of Van Wijk to be rediscovered: "Die Vokale i und y in den ostslavischen und den anderen slavischen Sprachen." It was originally meant to be his contribution to the Ivan Zilnyj Festschrift, which was being prepared in 1939 but did not appear because of the outbreak of the Second World War (cf. Schaeken 1988b: 149).
Wijk's own list — cf. Armstrong et al. 1975: 42, 92—: Bulgarian, 1345—46). In the Einleitung Van Wijk explains that he has not been able to take the full redaction of the Skete Patericon into consideration, because the only manuscripts in which the full redaction is presented are Russian and because Russian manuscripts happened to be almost inaccessible at the time Van Wijk was writing. Moreover, "der so wichtige Methodianische Text" should be published without delay (cf. Armstrong et al. 1975: 45).

2. Van Wijk's edition of the Old Church Slavonic 'Ανάρσαν ψηλάν βίβλος was intended to appear as a separate issue of the Munich journal Südost-Forschungen, edited by Fritz Valjavec. However, the outbreak of the Second World War prevented publication and the manuscript was accordingly sent back to Leiden. When it arrived in 1941, Van Wijk was no longer alive. In the same year Kuiper wrote in his obituary: "Das Manuskript liegt druckfertig vor und wird hoffentlich nach Beendigung des Krieges bald erscheinen können" (1941: 393). His hopes proved to be in vain.

It took no less than thirty years after the end of the War until Van Wijk's manuscript finally appeared in 1975 as volume 1 of Mouton's series Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, edited by D. Armstrong, R. Pope and C.H. van Schooneveld. In his foreword to the edition (1975: V—VIII) Van Schooneveld relates the unfavourable circumstances which in large part caused publication to be delayed for such a long time. The difficult task of the typesetting of the book as well as financial problems must for the first editor (Van Schooneveld) have played a crucial role in the delay until the end of the 1950s. When both obstacles had been more or less removed, H.G. Lunt acquired possession of the manuscript in the summer of 1959 and undertook to edit it. For some reason, however, Lunt did not feel it possible to deliver the manuscript for typesetting within a reasonable period. After more than twelve years, Van Schooneveld resumed his task as editor (together with Armstrong and Pope) of Van Wijk's manuscript.

3. Let us return to the year 1941. Van Schooneveld informs us in his foreword (1975: V): "Professor Valjavec decided to send the manuscript of the Methodius Patericon back to Holland, where, with the exception of page 3 of the Introduction, which was evidently lost in transit, it arrived after Van Wijk's death" (my italics). At the spot where page 3 of the Einleitung is missing in the edition (1975: 31), Pope writes: "We know from note 2 on p. 68 of this "Einleitung" that the page (. . .) dealt at least in part with the so-called Roman Patericon. Apparently the Sinaïtic Patericon, or at least Leonid's views on it, was also mentioned. See below, p. 36, note 14" (1975: 31, n. a). A few months ago I found two almost identical copies of the missing page 3 in the Leiden Van Wijk archives. I have here used the version which was apparently meant to appear in print for reproduction in facsimile and for the subjoined transliteration. On the back of this copy Van Wijk wrote down the apparatus criticus of folio 6r of the Mikhaonikoi-Patericon.

The same apparatus as well as the full text of folio 6r can also be found on a separate piece of paper which belongs evidently to the other copy of page 3. Since the missing folio 6r in Van Wijk's manuscript has already been supplied by the editors (cf. 1975: 103—104), I shall not reproduce its contents here.

The fact that Van Wijk made two copies of page 3, which are slightly different from each other (one being obviously an earlier version of the other), offers a clue for answering the question how this part could have been separated from the rest of the manuscript. Since Van Wijk was apparently used to making the necessary corrections and additions in his manuscripts only just before the very beginning of the typesetting, I conjecture that at the time of the author's death page 3 of the Einleitung was still (or again) in Leiden for correction, whereas the rest of the text was in the care of the editor in Munich. Subsequently, after 1941 the manuscript arrived in the safe of the Board of Trustees of the University of Leiden, while the two copies of page 3 disappeared out of sight in the Leiden Van Wijk archives.

Following I shall give the text of page 3 of the Einleitung, which is to be inserted on page 31 of the edition. Then I intend to discuss its contents.

---


3. When in 1928 De Gruyter Publishing House was too occupied to take on the typesetting of the second part of the Geschichte der altkirchenslawischen Sprache, the manuscript was sent back to the author. Van Wijk, however, immediately returned it to the publishers: "Ich möchte Sie bitten, mir den guten Empfang zu bestätigen und es mir etwa einen Monat vor der Drucklegung nach vorberiger Mitteilung für die Addenda auszuschicken" (draft of a letter of 21 April 1928, kept in the Leiden Van Wijk archives).
JOS SCHAEKEN

Ein so leichter habe ich davon abgesehen, als der Wortschatz des Normokansons, der ein juristischer Text ist, notwendigerweise bedeutend von demjenigen des Paterikons abweicht.

Der Frage, welches Paterikon in der Legende gemeint ist, hat man weniger Aufmerksamkeit gewidmet als dieselbe verdient hätte. Es handelt ja doch urn einen der iiltesten kirchenslavischen Texte! Sobolevskij hat einige male die Ansicht ausgesprochen, dass das von Method ubersetzte Paterikon die griechische Ubersetzung des Dialogi de vita et miraculis patrum italicorum et de aeternitate animarum Gregors des Grossen gewesen sei, welche als eine Untersuchung in: Studien zu den altkirchenslavischen Paterika (= Verhandlungen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, afd. letterkunde N.R. 58/3), Amsterdam 1931, -JS.

...
4. Page 3 is part of the first chapter of the Einleitung: “Das Problem von Methods Paterikon-Übersetzung” (1975: 29–32). Here Van Wijk discusses chapter XV of the Vita Methodii, which deals with the literary activities of Methodius after the death of his brother: преложил Васе книгу согласно, оставил по-русски книгу преложил. Especially the question of what is to be understood by the ambiguous phrase otsušskyja knigy interested Van Wijk.

In the winter of 1930–31 the antiquarian bookseller E. von Scherling showed Van Wijk two folia of a Serbian Church Slavonic text (now Leiden, MS BPL 2290). A few months later Van Wijk (1931) published the two folia, which he had identified as a part of a Slavic translation of the ‘Avoprov αυτοκρατορος (Skete Patericon). In the same article he tried for the first time to determine what text the phrase otsušskyja knigy refers to and concluded that it is in all likelihood a direct translation of πατερικός (scil. βιβλίον). About the much debated question which type of patericon Methodius translated Van Wijk was in doubt. In his contribution to the Second Congress of Slavists in Warsaw 1934 he finally decided on the Skete Patericon: "Nie ulega wątpliwości, że mamy tu do czynienia z tekstem z okresu panonisko-morawskiego. Otóż, ponieważ "Legenda Panoniska" wspomina o tłumaczeniu jakiegoś "Paterika" przez Św. Metodego, przypuszczam, że tym "Paterikiem" jest właśnie nasz tekst" (1934: 168, cf. also 1937). In numerous articles he adduced linguistic arguments (archaisms, especially Pannono-moravianisms, both in grammar and in lexicon) as well as extralinguistic arguments in support of the Methodian origin of the Skete Patericon. 5

5. I shall now discuss the first paragraph, the last paragraph and footnote 3 of page 3 in relation to the rest of chapter I of the Einleitung.

Before entering upon the actual issue of his book, Van Wijk (cf. Armstrong et al. 1975: 30–31) takes a stand on the identification of Methodius' nomokanon (reksië zakona pravilo) as mentioned in VM XV. Lexical characteristics lead him to believe that Methodius obviously translated the collection of John Scholasticus entitled Synagoge in Fifty Titles, and not the

Van Wijk was fully aware of the fact that an examination of the lexical relationships between Methodius' nomocanon, Methodius' patericon, and the oldest biblical texts would be of great value to enlarge our knowledge of the Pannonomoravian type of language. However, "WENN ich nicht furchte, dass ich das Erschienen meiner Paterik-Ausgabe bedeutend zu verzögern, hätte ich jene Arbeit selber gemacht und die Resultate in dieses Buch aufgenommen. Um so leichter habe ich davon abgesehen, als der Wortschatz..." (cf. Armstrong et al. 1975: 31). The first paragraph of page 3 follows immediately after this quotation.

In the last paragraph of page 3 Van Wijk turns to Nikol'skij's view (1928) of the *oSobolevskij knyg* in *VM XV* refers to interpretative biblical commentaries rather than some kind of patericon. Van Wijk (cf. Armstrong et al. 1975: 31-32) opposes this theory by arguing that (1) a short and illustrative text such as a patericon would be the most appropriate edifying literature for enlightening a wide audience, and (2) biblical commentaries reflect in general the lexical type of language in Simeon's time (for more details see also idem 1931: 21-24). Pope (in Armstrong et al. 1975: 4-8) has already pointed out that some of Van Wijk's arguments for attacking Nikol'skij's theory can scarcely hold up against a more critical approach of the matter.

In footnote 3 of page 3 Van Wijk refers to a "rather" old manuscript of the *Sinattic Patericon* (i.e., the Slavic translation of the *Arqüph zvëzqerëks* of John Moschos), which is in fact the twelfth-century MS 551, Synodal Collection, State Historical Museum in Moscow. Elsewhere in his edition (cf. Armstrong et al. 1975: 36, 75-76) Van Wijk attempts to refute the idea of a Methodian provenance of the *Sinattic Patericon* (cf. also idem 1931: 30-33). He stresses the absence of Pannonomoravianisms and draws up a list of grammatical and lexical elements which can hardly be attributed to the Methodian type of language, their archaic character notwithstanding.  

6. The main text of page 3 of the *Einleitung* deals with the rejection of Sobolevskij's theory that Methodius translated the *Roman Patericon*. Here and elsewhere (1931: 27-30, 1933: 34, 1938: 6), Van Wijk argues that

the lexical elements represented in the *Roman Patericon* show clearly that the text cannot have been translated from Greek before the late ninth or tenth century, in all likelihood somewhere on Bulgarian territory.

Rather recently Mareš (1972, 1974, 1986) has defended Sobolevskij's idea about the supremacy of the *Roman Patericon*. If we confine ourselves to Mareš' counterattack against Van Wijk's objections based on the lexicon, the former argues that the oldest version of the *Roman Patericon*, on the one hand, evidently reveals a lexical layer of Pannonomoravian origin. On the other hand, Mareš (cf. especially 1972: 211-212, 1974: 26-28) tries to point out that the lexical elements Van Wijk (cf. page 3 of the *Einleitung* and 1931: 29) considered to be of relatively recent East Bulgarian origin, are very old and not specifically Bulgarian at all, as far as they are attested in the oldest version ("version A"), and as far as they cannot be shown to be the work of later scribes. However, it should be noted that Mareš mainly concentrates on Van Wijk's list of supposed younger Bulgarians, which in its turn is an abstract of Sobolevskij's (non-exhaustive) word-list of the *Roman Patericon*. It is regrettable that in this respect only part of the vocabulary has been taken into account, especially since a negative proof (i.e., the absence of lexical Bulgarians) for the Methodian provenance of the *Roman* as well as the *Sinattic* or *Skete* *Patericon* is more substantial than a positive proof (i.e., the presence of lexical Pannonomoravianisms), as Pope has already pointed out: "it would surprise me if any late ninth or very early tenth-century Bulgarian texts, translated before the norms of the Preslav School had really solidified (...), did not preserve some lexical Pannonomoravianisms and did not resemble the oldest Methodian texts" (in Armstrong et al. 1975: 24).

Finally, it should be stressed that, as far as I know, Mareš never in any detail has accounted for his rejection of Van Wijk's (and others') adherence to the *Skete Patericon* theory. Hence, as long as Mareš does not support his refutation by adducing convincing arguments, I cannot accept his conclusion that the *Roman Patericon* is the best candidate to claim the title "Methodius* Patericon": "die otybáškyj knyg" die patriarchal Bücher, *libri Patrum*, von denen Übersetzung ins Slavische Vita Methodi berichtet, waren mit hoher Wahrscheinlichkeit Gregorii Magni *Dialogorum libri quattuor*" (Mares 1972: 216-217). Even if we accept Mareš' theory, there is in
my opinion still another, equally suited candidate: the Skete Patericon, which has been proven by Van Wijk to be definitely of an archaic Methodist type of language.

University of Leiden
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